



Inter Agency Paper

No. 3/January 2011

Is a Sense of Community Vital to Interagency Coordination?

William J. Davis, Jr., Ph.D.
U.S. Army Command and General Staff College

Col. Arthur D. Simons Center
for the Study of Interagency Cooperation

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas

An Interagency Occasional Paper published by
the CGSC Foundation Press

Report Documentation Page			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
<p>Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.</p>				
1. REPORT DATE JAN 2011	2. REPORT TYPE	3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2011 to 00-00-2011		
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Is a Sense of Community Vital to Interagency Coordination?			5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
			5b. GRANT NUMBER	
			5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)			5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
			5e. TASK NUMBER	
			5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, Col. Arthur D. Simons Center, 655 Biddle Blvd., PO Box 3429, Fort Leavenworth, KS, 66027			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
			11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited				
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
14. ABSTRACT				
15. SUBJECT TERMS				
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Same as Report (SAR)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 28
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON	

Is a Sense of Community Vital to Interagency Coordination?

William J. Davis, Jr., Ph.D.
U.S. Army Command and General Staff College

**The Col. Arthur D. Simons Center
for the Study of Interagency Cooperation**

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas

Interagency Paper No. 3, January 2011

Is a Sense of Community Vital to Interagency Coordination?

by William J. Davis, Jr., Ph.D.
U.S. Army Command and General Staff College

Dr. William Joseph Davis, Jr. is an associate professor of strategic and operational studies for the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College. He graduated Harvard University in 1982, was commissioned as a Naval Officer, and spent 14 years flying F-14s before becoming an associate professor and director of curriculum at the U.S. Joint Forces Staff College. He has a doctorate from Old Dominion University and a masters from Marine Corps University.

This paper represents the opinions of the authors and does not reflect the official views of the Department of the Army, the Department of Defense, the United States Government, the Simons Center, or the Command and General Staff College Foundation.

Publications released by the Simons Center are not copyrighted, however the Simons Center requests acknowledgment in the use of its materials in other works.

Questions about this paper and the Interagency Paper series should be directed to the Col. Arthur D. Simons Center, 655 Biddle Blvd., PO Box 3429, Fort Leavenworth KS 66027; email: office@TheSimonsCenter.org, or by phone at 913-682-7244.

Contents

Introduction	1
The Research.....	5
Analysis of Results	8
Analytic Appendix	12
Sample of the Interagency SCI II Survey	15
Endnotes	18
References	19

Introduction

The general officer had just returned from a deployment to Iraq and was holding a town meeting to inform the community of the challenges he had faced. During the briefing, he digressed into a diatribe that openly denigrated the contributions, or perceived lack thereof, of other government agencies.

What causes a large group to operate in an efficient, effective, innovative manner? Is it the way it is organized, its executive structure, its mechanisms for gathering and disseminating information, its internal communications, its analytic capacity, its contributions from staff, its morale, or its sense of community? Research for this paper largely examined the role of the last factor, a sense of community in U.S. interagency relations. The results of that research, as discussed toward the end of the paper, were surprising.

Since September 11, 2001, there has been significant interest within Congress and the Executive branch to make the disparate agencies of federal government—both civilian and military—operate more efficiently and in a more coordinated manner as they address the complex problems that face the nation. Many thinkers have suggested that interagency coordination might follow the path previously trod by the Department of Defense when it began to operate according to the mandate of the Goldwater-Nichols Act (GNA). In 1986, the U. S. Congress passed the GNA with the aim of forcing greater cooperation among the military services. In order to overcome various service barriers to joint cooperation, GNA required officers in each service to have experience in joint headquarters operations and in joint (inter-service) education programs as preconditions for mid-level and senior promotions (Locher, 2001).

Congressman Ike Skeleton, one of the primary architects of the legislation, in a conversation with this author, also asserted that a critical objective of GNA was to dispel misperceptions commonly held by each military service regarding the cultures of the other military services. By dispelling myths and misperceptions through an increase in inter-service education and joint military exercises,

Since September 11, 2001, there has been significant interest within Congress and the Executive branch to make the disparate agencies of federal government—both civilian and military—operate more efficiently and in a more coordinated manner as they address the complex problems that face the nation.

there was an expectation that something of a shared sense of community would arise in the joint realm, just as it existed in the individual services. Perhaps with the benefit of increased inter-service education, the general officer in the vignette above might have better understood the differing cultures, capabilities, budgets, responsibilities, and objectives of other government agencies. Also, if he had had more experience in joint military or interagency exercises, he might have had an increased “sense of community” with the other interagency players, and a less visceral reaction to agencies whose main shortcoming was only that they were not like the military.

THE PROJECT FOR NATIONAL SECURITY REFORM

In 2008, under the guidance of James R. Locher III, the Project for National Security Reform (PNSR) was begun to aid in transforming the various federal agencies from a fractious set of bureaucracies into organizations that could smoothly “inter-operate” to address problems. Locher was also a critical draftsman of the Goldwater-Nichols Act (GNA), which is credited with transforming the U.S. military from a splintered and uncoordinated organization into a coordinated and highly effective one. Though the GNA effectuated a change of culture in the Department of Defense, the PNSR has a much more difficult task ahead of it. Rather than reorganizing a single agency (which has the helpful characteristics of a hierarchy and a single budget), the PNSR is attempting to reorganize a whole host of government agencies, each with its own budget, stakeholders, hierarchy, and culture (Breul, 2008). Accordingly, it would be premature for policy makers to look strictly at the apparent success of GNA and attempt to replicate its success through imitation without first investigating the underlying theory and causes for its success. A solution that works well for one culture will not necessarily produce the same results in another.

As the nation develops its strategy to deepen and improve broader interagency coordination, it needs to consider, and if possible determine, whether a shared sense of community will advance or be a critical factor in such coordination.

As the nation develops its strategy to deepen and improve broader interagency coordination (i.e. coordination among the various civilian agencies as well as with the military establishment), it needs to consider, and if possible determine, whether a shared sense of community (SOC) will advance or be a critical factor in such coordination. As indicated earlier, that is what the research for this paper was about. As a first step in making such a determination, research for this paper focused on measuring the current level of the SOC between Department of Defense officers and other government agencies.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

It is the position of this paper that the “Sense of Community”

theory, initially developed by Chavis, Hogge, McMillan, and Wandersman in 1986, is the theory to which practitioners, educators, and trainers should look for guidance in order to ensure that a “whole of government” (interagency) approach to solving complex contingencies is optimized (Davidson, 2009). During recent years, the SOC has received significant attention from scholars as a viable psychological and sociological concept. Although there are many definitions of the term “community” in the literature, a factor common to many of these definitions is the concept of “belongingness.” Bellah, et.al. (1985) define community as the following:

A community is a group of people who are socially interdependent, who participate together in discussion and decision-making, and who share certain practices that both define the community and are nurtured by it. Such a community is not quickly formed. It almost always has a history and so is also a community of memory, defined in part by its past and its memory of the past. (p. 333)

In essence, a “sense of community is a feeling that members have of belonging, a feeling that members matter to one another and to the group, and a shared faith that members’ needs will be met through their commitment to be together” (Bellah et al. p. 9). A sense of community embraces the concept that community is an aggregate variable, comprised of more than one component, and each component is critical to the larger concept of community. For example, McMillan’s (1996) revised SOC theory offers that there are four components that comprise a sense of community—spirit, trust, trade, and art—and all must be present in order for a sense of community to emerge.

According to McMillan, spirit (originally labeled membership in the earlier version of sense of community theory) denotes membership in a community and includes the feelings of friendship, bonding, esprit de corps, and cohesiveness that develop in a community. Spirit also implies and leads to emotional safety for its members. The second element of sense of community defined by McMillan is trust (which replaced influence in the original theory) and represents a willingness of the community member to rely on others in the community. Trust includes a belief that the community will wield its authority and power in a fair and just manner. Not only does each member of a community feel safe and trust the community, but the element of trust also encompasses the notion that other members of the community, and the community as whole, trust each member. The trade component of the theory focuses on differences among individual members. Trading takes place when one member possesses a quality another member lacks. Trading

A community is a group of people who are socially interdependent, who participate together in discussion and decision-making, and who share certain practices that both define the community and are nurtured by it.

which is considered fair, in which one receives from others while also giving to others, contributes to a sense of balance and helps build a strong group. The final component of McMillan's sense of community is art (which replaced "shared emotional connections" in the original SOC theory). Art is the collective experiences of the community, and in turn, the community's experiences in total are the foundation of art. Shared experiences that become part of the community's history are critical to the art component. The community must have some type of interaction for art to be present and evolve. Most importantly, art reinforces spirit, which serves as a basis for a perpetual cycle of community. This cycle evolves, and while evolving, the cycle should also be strengthening as the experiences of a given community deepen.

Using the SOC approach, Hall (2008) conducted a study based on work with 300 major multinational corporations and 50,000 individuals. He found that not only is a sense of community essential to cooperation, it also correlated to faster change, lower costs, and higher retention. Burgoon et al. (2005) found that, although not necessary for task completion, active participation by a large cohort of members in a community's operations or affairs significantly increased trust—a key component for developing a SOC. Sengupta et al. (2006) similarly suggest that education and communication, along with employee participation and involvement in the process, are critical in ensuring optimal implementation of any organizational changes.

Research for this paper was conducted on the assumption that the above findings were valid and that an application of SOC theory to the task of improving interagency cooperation and coordination could be useful, if not critical.

PURPOSES OF THIS PAPER

This paper serves two purposes. First it attempts to measure the SOC that military officers have regarding the three groups with which they work:

- Members of their own service.
- Members of other military services.
- Members of other (non-military) agencies.

Second, the paper attempts to determine the relationship between military officers' SOC and their perception of the efficacy and importance of the different communities in addressing complex problems. In addition, research for this paper also attempted to determine if certain experiences affected the officers' perceptions.

The SOC of the joint community is incorporated as a comparative

variable. Comparing the SOC within a service (i.e. the Army) to the SOC felt toward the joint military community can provide a rough measure of the efficacy of the GNA reform since 1985 in creating an SOC across the military community. That measure may then be used as an indicator of what to expect from similar sorts of reform of interagency relations, as is contemplated by the PNSR.

The Research

OUTLINE OF RESEARCH

To measure the SOC among groups and the relation of SOC to officers' perceptions, the author queried and surveyed 208 military officers. The officers were divided into three groups, and each was asked to answer 25 questions to determine his or her SOC toward only one particular community, i.e. his or her own service, the joint military community or the interagency community. Each officer was then asked to answer an additional seven questions on deployments and his or her interactions with and opinions of non-military agencies. Lastly, each officer was asked to anonymously answer five questions to identify his/her service, years of duty, active (or not) status, gender, and rank. Please, refer to the appendices for a sample survey and full explanation of the methodology.

The purpose of the surveys was to answer the following three fundamental research questions:

1. Is there a difference in the SOC felt among military members toward the joint, interagency, or own service communities based on service, rank, or experience, specifically:
 - a. whether respondent had combat deployments.
 - b. whether respondent had worked with the subject community.
2. Is there a difference: (a) in the perceived importance of the joint, service, and interagency communities to U. S. national interests abroad and at home; or (b) in the perceived efficacy of those communities in solving problems; and (c) are any differences in perception based on ones service, whether one had combat deployments, whether one had worked with the subject community, or the rank of the Service member?
3. What is the relationship between the SOC felt toward the joint, interagency, or own service communities and the perceived importance and efficacy of those communities in addressing complex problems abroad and in the U. S.? Are those perceptions based on

or affected by ones service, whether one had combat deployments, whether one had worked with the subject community, or on ones rank?

CONDUCT OF THE RESEARCH

Each of the independent variables identified in the above research questions was carefully selected on the basis of a broad review of articles relating to SOC, organizational and military culture, and command and control, as well as the suggestions of numerous military and education professionals. The surveyed population consisted of U. S. military officers from the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines in the ranks of O-2 to O-6. The officers surveyed were attending courses at the Army Logistics University, Fort Lee, Virginia; the Joint Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Virginia; or US Army Command and General Staff College satellite campus at Fort Lee, Virginia. An initial survey population (n) of 236 surveys were collected, but 28 surveys had incomplete data and were not used (resulting in a 12 percent rate of collected surveys not used), leaving the researcher with 208 useful surveys.

THE SURVEY: THE SENSE OF COMMUNITY INDEX II

The Sense of Community Index (SCI) is one of the most frequently used quantitative measures of SOC. It has been used in numerous studies covering different cultures on four continents, as well as in many contexts (e.g., urban, suburban, rural, tribal, workplaces, schools, universities, recreational clubs, internet communities, etc.). The SCI is based on the theory of SOC presented by McMillan and Chavis (1986). Later, the SCI was revised by Chavis and renamed SCI II. For purposes of this research, the SCI II more fully accounts for all of the variables within SOC theory, and its shift from a dichotomous, true-false format to a Likert scale format also significantly increases the internal consistency and reliability of the SCI. Analysis of SCI II showed that it is a reliable measure (coefficient alpha=.94) (Chavis, 2008).¹

DATA

Data were collected at the approved educational institutions detailed above. The result for this research was n=208. Of these 208 surveys, 70 measured SOC toward the joint community, 60 toward own-service community, and 78 toward interagency community. More specifically, of the 208 officers who were surveyed, roughly 1/3 completed a joint questionnaire, 1/3 a service questionnaire, and 1/3 an interagency questionnaire. The types of SOC surveys were randomly distributed. Table 1 below shows the frequency breakdown of the independent variable data. Average years of service for the

respondents were 13.37, with a standard deviation (SD) of 6.52.

Table 1: Variable Frequencies and Distributions

Variable	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Joint questionnaires	70	33.7	33.7
Service questionnaires	60	28.8	62.5
Interagency questionnaires	78	37.5	100
Service (Army)	163	78.4	78.4
Service (Navy)	16	7.7	86.1
Service (Air Force)	20	9.6	95.7
Service (Marines)	9	4.3	100
Grade (O-2)	4	1.9	1.9
Grade (O-3)	108	51.9	53.8
Grade (O-4)	50	24	77.9
Grade (O-5)	32	15.4	93.3
Grade (O-6)	14	6.7	100
Combat (yes)	186	89.4	89.4
Combat (no)	22	10.6	100
Worked JSI† (yes)	146	70.5	70.5
Worked JSI (no)	61	29.5	100*
Sex (male)	173	83.2	83.2
Sex (female)	35	16.8	100
Status (active duty)	198	95.7	95.7
Status (reserves)	3	1.4	97.1
Status (National Guard)	6	2.9	100

† joint, service, interagency

*one missing record, N=207 for this group

METHODOLOGY EMPLOYED

For each primary question, independent and dependent variables were identified and a null hypothesis was developed. Each null hypothesis was generally tested using a multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA). Results were then graphed, and statistically significant relations were identified per rankings by p, eta-squared, and multivariate effects. Dunnet C post hoc results and relevant mean differences were also noted and summarized in tabular form.

In addition to Table 1, the research was summarized in 5 tables, all shown in the Appendix. They included the following:

- Means for dependent variables.
- Dunnet C post hoc results for JSI and rank.
- Pooled means for dependent variables.
- Tukey HSD post hoc results for JSI.
- Partial correlation coefficients controlling for influencing factors.

Analysis of Results

While there were no main effects noted in pursuit of the answer of research question one, there was a significant interaction effect between community type and rank.

While there were no main effects noted in pursuit of the answer of research question one, there was a significant interaction effect between community type (JSI) and rank. The post hoc not only revealed a statistical difference in the art component of SOC between the service and interagency community, but, in addition, the MANOVA in research question one showed a statistically significant difference in SOC and its components based on the intersection of rank and community. It appeared that O-3s (the youngest of the ranks surveyed) exhibited statistically significant less psychological SOC in total and in each component of SOC. This phenomenon might be the result of the way O-3s are perceived and, thusly, perceive themselves in the military culture. O-3s are perceived to be “junior officers” and have not made the transition to organizational leadership or “buy in.” A commonly expressed admonition to O-4s is: “You are no longer able to blame bad things on the ‘them,’ because now that you have been promoted to O-4, you are the ‘them.’”

An additional area that might have influenced SOC is that all O-3s were from the Army. Over the past nine years, the Army has asked O-3s to perform repeated deployments to combat zones. Brodsky (1996) documented the concept of negative SOC in certain urban or harsh environments. Results suggested that a lack of SOC, rather than a null finding, could be meaningful. Perhaps what the results indicate is that the Army is indeed pushing its members to the breaking point. Suicides in the Army have peaked, and there is a lot of dissatisfaction with the manner in which the Army has taken on the burden of most of the missions in Iraq and Afghanistan (Moon, 2007). A significant component of SOC is the ability of its members to not only interact and give to the community, but also for the community to interact and meet the needs of its members. All

components must be present in order for members to have an SOC.

The MANOVA for research question two showed no statistically significant main effects or interaction effects. This statistical finding was surprising to the researcher because during additional runs of preliminary statistical tests, there were significant differences between two of the three dependent variables based solely upon community, specifically $p < .05$ for perceived importance of addressing interests abroad and perceived ability to address complex problems. The difference resided between service perceptions and interagency perceptions. However, when confounding and independent variables were statistically considered, there was no statistical difference in the perceptions across the communities. This finding, which was supported by a high observed statistical power (great confidence in the accuracy of the finding), indicated strong internal validity of the model.

The partial correlation coefficients showed moderate to high correlation among the three dependent variables of perceived importance in interests abroad, perceived importance in domestic interests, and perceived ability to address complex problems. However, SOC had moderate to low correlation with each of these variables. A thorough review of SOC theory does not reveal that a SOC is tied to the individual's perceived efficacy or importance of the community. For instance, a member of the Naval Service may have strong feelings of spirit, trust, trade, and art with the Navy, but that does not necessarily indicate that he or she will feel the Navy community can address certain complex problems in an adequate fashion.

IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Two very important research findings will have implications for those who attempt to reform or make policy concerning interagency operations. First, there is minimal correlation between a psychological SOC and the perceived importance of the joint, own service, or interagency communities. This finding means that the predilection to label a community as not important or inept does not depend on how much a person feels or does not feel a sense of community with that group. In other words, a person may have a great feeling of community towards the U.S. Navy, but that does not necessarily equate to a belief that the U.S. Navy is either important for certain things or even adept at addressing problems. Similarly, the effectiveness of ad hoc operations (as in the case of the unforeseen disaster relief operation in Haiti) that require various agencies to work together on a moment's notice does not rely on members of those agencies having developed a rich sense of community. In

...the predilection to label a community as not important or inept does not depend on how much a person feels or does not feel a sense of community with that group.

...education and experience may mitigate any predisposed tendency to be insular and think of “other communities” (interagency) as less able or less important.

particular, a SOC is not necessary for military officers to respect and cooperate with other agencies. That finding is surprising as it appears to contradict the findings of Hall (2008) that state that a sense of community is essential to cooperation and correlates to faster change. That said, however, the second finding, discussed below, suggests that military officers’ SOC with other agencies does seem to improve with experience and rank.

The second significant finding is a compendium of two sub findings. The first sub finding indicates that although there are basic differences in the SOC military members felt toward the joint, own service, and interagency communities, those differences diminished as the rank of the respondents increased (higher rank often equates to higher education, experience, and professionalism) and as they gained more experience working with the other communities. This sub-finding is interesting because it demonstrates that although the culture may initially be insular, it is open to integration based on education and experience.

The second sub-finding significantly supports the first. There was no difference in the perceived importance or ability to address problems once all variables were calculated into the statistical problem. Initially it appeared (when a simple ANOVA was performed) as though the interagency community would be denigrated; however, once the variables of working with the agency and rank were statistically accounted for, there were no differences in perceptions. This again indicates that education and experience may mitigate any predisposed tendency to be insular and think of “other communities” (interagency) as less able or less important. This finding supports those within government who surmise that a GNA approach to solving interagency coordination problems might be useful in achieving a more effective, whole of government effort towards managing complex contingencies.

Recommendations for further research into this area should focus on interviewing a more diverse representation of military services. The U.S. Army comprised 78.4 percent of the researcher’s accessible population. This might have exposed the researcher to a history threat because of the current operating environment for Army personnel. Although the researcher controlled for the threat by collecting data on combat deployments, there is the possibility that it may not have been enough. Another recommendation for further study would be to expand this research to members of agencies other than Department of Defense.

The National Security Strategy devotes considerable attention to ensuring an efficient interagency effort in support of national interests. However, as the United States undertakes an

effort to bring together its disparate agencies and other stakeholders, it must ensure the changes made are thoughtful, calculated, and supported by research, experience, and intellect. It took four years and 241 days (which was longer than U.S. involvement in World War II) for Congress to pass the GNA which reformed only a single agency (Locher, 2002). This author posits that for the PNSR to have any chance of doing likewise for the interagency, it must have useful data in order to complete the task within a lifetime. Such research is a necessary element as the community of professionals tasked with improving the interagency begins to investigate the phenomena surrounding its responsibilities. The education of national security professionals should focus on overcoming perceptions that might inhibit the effective workings of the interagency—the reputation and perhaps the survival of the nation depend on it. **IAP**

The education of national security professionals should focus on overcoming perceptions that might inhibit the effective workings of the interagency—the reputation and perhaps the survival of the nation depend on it.

Analytic Appendix

RESEARCH QUESTION 1

The null hypothesis that was tested to answer the first research question was Ho1: There will be no difference in the sense of community felt among military members towards the joint, service, or interagency communities based upon service, rank, combat deployments, or whether respondent has worked with the subject community. This null hypothesis was tested using a multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA). Community type (joint, service, interagency), rank, whether a combat deployment had been made, and working with the subject community were the independent variables. The dependent variables were overall sense of community (SOC) and its four components (spirit, trust, trade, and art) as measured by the Sense of Community Index II instrument.²

Results for Research Question 1

The pooled means (with standard deviations in parentheses) for the overall SOC and its four components is detailed in Table 2.

Table 2: Means for Dependent Variables (standard deviation in parentheses)

Variable	Joint Mean	Service Mean	Interagency Mean
Overall SOC	37.10 (12.19)	36.55 (10.98)	33.14 (12.68)
Spirit	9.53 (3.37)	9.23 (2.72)	8.67 (3.72)
Trust	8.89 (3.95)	9.58 (3.48)	8.10 (3.59)
Trade	9.33 (3.70)	8.62 (3.23)	8.04 (3.47)
Art	9.41 (3.64)	9.98 (3.93)	8.26 (3.96)

The first MANOVA was conducted to determine if the dependent SOC variables or any of the SOC's four parts significantly differed as per research question one. There was no statistical significance identified with the exception of an interaction of JSI and rank with $p=.022$; eta-squared .05; and multivariate effects power of .952, which is high observed power. There was a Dunnet C post hoc result $p<.05$ between service art and interagency art, mean difference (I-J) 1.73. Additional results of the Dunnet C post hoc, $p<.05$ are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3: Dunnet C Post Hoc Results for JSI and Rank

Variable	(I) Rank	(J) Rank	Mean Difference (I-J)
Spirit	O-3	O-4	-1.77
Trust	O-3	O-4	-2.67
Trade	O-3	O-4	-2.38
Art	O-3	O-4	-3.57
SOC	O-3	O-4	-8.87

RESEARCH QUESTION 2

The null hypotheses tested to answer the second research question was Ho2: There will be no difference in perceived importance of the joint, service, and interagency communities to U.S. national interests abroad and at home or the perceived efficacy of those communities in solving problems based on service, whether respondent had combat deployments, whether respondent had worked with the subject community, or the rank of the service member. The pooled means of the three dependent variables of perceived importance in achieving national interests abroad, in achieving domestic interests, and in the ability to address complex problems are reported in Table 4, with standard deviation (SD) in parentheses:³

Table 4: Pooled Means for Dependent Variables (with SD in parentheses)

Variable	Joint Mean	Service Mean	Interagency Mean
Interest Abroad	4.37 (.66)	4.18 (.89)	3.80 (1.00)
Interest Domestic	3.93 (1.03)	3.85 (1.01)	3.56 (.99)
Address Problems	3.76 (.71)	3.67 (.77)	3.14 (.99)

The first MANOVA was conducted to determine if the dependent variables differed as per research question two. There was no statistical significance identified either with a main effect or interaction. However, the researcher did conduct a one-way ANOVA to evaluate if the pooled means differed based only upon community questioned. Statistical significance was found between groups for interests abroad, $p=.004$ and ability to address problems, $p=.000$. Results of a Tukey HSD post hoc are shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Tukey HSD Post Hoc Results for JSI

Variable	(I) JSI	(J) JSI	(I-J) Mean Difference
Interest Abroad	Joint	Interagency	.47
Address Problems	Joint	Interagency	.62
Address Problems	Service	Interagency	.53

RESEARCH QUESTION 3

The null hypothesis tested to answer the third research question was Ho3: There will be no relationship between the SOC felt by military members and the perceived importance and efficacy of those communities in addressing complex problems abroad and in the United States based on service, combat deployments, rank, or whether respondent has worked with the subject community. This relationship was tested using partial correlations controlling for service, combat deployments, worked with the subject communities, or rank. The results are shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Partial Correlation Coefficients Controlling for Rank, Service, JSI, Combat Deployments

	SOC	Interest Abroad	Interest Domestically	Address Problem
SOC	---	.3167 p=.000	.2039 p=.003	.3613 p=.000
Int Abroad	.3167 p=.000	---	.5493 p=.000	.4561 p=.000
Int Dom	.2039 p=.003	.5493 p=.000	---	.4670 p=.000
Address	.3613 p=.000	.4561 p=.000	.4670 p=.000	----

Sample of the Interagency SCI II Survey

Note: Similar surveys for joint and own service community were also administered

This research is being conducted to determine the relationship between feeling of community and perceived efficacy of the interagency in order to determine a more effective way to conduct operations. **Your participation in this research is COMPLETELY VOLUNTARY.** If you choose to participate in this survey please be aware that the information provided will in no manner be linked to you personally (do not put your name on any part of the survey) and that the researchers have taken every precaution to ensure the confidentiality of your responses. The projected average time it will take to complete this survey is between 5 and 8 minutes. Thank you for helping to expand the body of knowledge concerning this very important facet of operations.

Instructions:

The following questions about community refer to the community known as “THE INTERAGENCY.” When answering the questions, please insert your concept of the interagency for the term community when appropriate. Please clearly mark your responses. Thank you.

START HERE

How important is it to you to feel a sense of community with other interagency members?

Prefer not to be A Part of this Community	Not Important at All	Not Very Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
---	-------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------	-------------------

How well does each of the following statements represent how you feel about this community (interagency)?

I get important needs of mine met because I am part of this community. Not at all Somewhat Mostly Completely

Community members and I value the same things. Not at all Somewhat Mostly Completely

This community has been successful in getting the needs of its members met. Not at all Somewhat Mostly Completely

Being a member of this community makes me feel good. Not at all Somewhat Mostly Completely

When I have a problem, I can talk about it with members of this community. Not at all Somewhat Mostly Completely

People in this community have similar needs, priorities, and goals. Not at all Somewhat Mostly Completely

I can trust people in this community. Not at all Somewhat Mostly Completely

I can recognize most members of this community.	Not at all	Somewhat	Mostly	Completely
Most community members know me.	Not at all	Somewhat	Mostly	Completely
This community has symbols and expressions of membership such as clothes, signs, art, architecture, logos, landmarks, and flags that people can recognize.	Not at all	Somewhat	Mostly	Completely
I put a lot of time and effort into being part of this community.	Not at all	Somewhat	Mostly	Completely
Being a member of this community is a part of my identity.	Not at all	Somewhat	Mostly	Completely
Fitting into this community is important to me.	Not at all	Somewhat	Mostly	Completely
This community can influence other communities.	Not at all	Somewhat	Mostly	Completely
I care about what other community members think of me.	Not at all	Somewhat	Mostly	Completely
I have influence over what this community is like.	Not at all	Somewhat	Mostly	Completely
If there is a problem in this community, members can get it solved.	Not at all	Somewhat	Mostly	Completely
This community has good leaders.	Not at all	Somewhat	Mostly	Completely
It is very important to me to be a part of this community.	Not at all	Somewhat	Mostly	Completely
I am with other community members a lot and enjoy being with them.	Not at all	Somewhat	Mostly	Completely
I expect to be a part of this community for a long time.	Not at all	Somewhat	Mostly	Completely
Members of this community have shared important events together, such as holidays, celebrations, or disasters.	Not at all	Somewhat	Mostly	Completely
I feel hopeful about the future of this community.	Not at all	Somewhat	Mostly	Completely
Members of this community care about each other.	Not at all	Somewhat	Mostly	Completely

1. Have you been on a combat deployment? **Yes** **No**
2. Have you worked with the interagency while deployed? **Yes** **No**
3. Have you worked with the interagency in a non-deployed environment? **Yes** **No**

4. How many months total have you worked with the interagency? _____

5. How important is the interagency to addressing United States' interests abroad?

Not Important at All	Not Very Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
---------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-----------------------

6. How important is the interagency to addressing United States' interests domestically?

Not Important at All	Not Very Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
---------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-----------------------

7. How effective do you perceive the interagency to be in addressing complex problems?

Not effective at all	Not very effective	Somewhat effective	Effective	Very effective
---------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-----------------------

The following information is being collected for demographic purposes and in no way will be used to identify individuals.

1. Agency: **Army** **Navy** **Air Force** **Marine** **Other:** _____

2. Years of service in agency you marked above: _____

3. Are you: **Active Duty military** **Armed Forces reserve** **National Guard** **None**
Other _____

4. Sex: **Male** **Female**

5. Grade: **0-1** **0-2** **0-3** **0-4** **0-5** **0-6** **Other:** _____

If there are any questions, please contact Dr. Bill Davis, 804 765 8473, william.davis46@us.army.mil

Endnotes

- 1 Further validity and reliability data can be found at <[http://www.senseofcommunity.com/files/Sense%20of%20Community%20Index-2\(SCI-2\).pdf](http://www.senseofcommunity.com/files/Sense%20of%20Community%20Index-2(SCI-2).pdf)>
- 2 The minimum and maximum score for each element and overall sense of community are 0 and 18, and 0 and 72 respectively.
- 3 Minimum mean =1, maximum mean = 5.

References

- D. S. Alberts, *Information Age Transformation: Getting to a 21st Century Military*, Command and Control Research Program, Washington, D.C., 2002.
- N.B.Bellah, R.Madsen, W.M.Sullivan, A. Swindler, and S.M. Tipton, *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life*, University of California Press, Berkeley, CA,1985.
- N. Bensahel, “Mission Not Accomplished: What Went Wrong with Iraqi Reconstruction,” *The Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 3, pp. 453–473, June 2006.
- P.L. Bergerand and T.Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*, Anchor, New York, N.Y., 1967.
- J.D. Breul and J.M. Kamensky, “Federal Government Reform: Lesson’s from Clinton’s ‘Reinventing Government’ and Bush’s ‘Management Agenda’ Initiatives,” *Public Administration Review*, Washington, DC, Vol. 68, Issue 6, pp. 1009–1026, November/December 2008.
- A. E. Brodsky, “Resilient Single Mothers in Risky Neighborhoods: Negative Psychological Sense of Community,” *Journal of Community Psychology*, Vol. 24 (4), pp. 347–363, October 1996.
- J.K., Burgoon, S. Weisband, and J.Bonito, “Interactivity, Communication, and Trust: Further Studies of Leadership in the Electronic Age,” *Technical Report 1154*, U.S. Army Research Institute for Behavioral and Social Sciences, Arlington, VA, 2005.
- C. Castelfranchi and R.Falcone, “Social Trust: A Cognitive Approach,” National Research Council–Institute of Psychology, 2001.
- D.M Chavis, K.S.Lee, and J.D. Acosta, “The Sense of Community (SCI) Revised: The Reliability and Validity of the SCI-2,” Paper presented at the 2nd International Community Psychology Conference, Lisbon, Portugal, 2008.
- D.M. Chavis, J.H. Hogge, D.W. McMillan, and A.Wandersman, “Sense of Community Through a Brunswik’s Lens: A First Look,” *Journal of Community Psychology*, Vol. 14 (1), pp. 24–41, 1986.
- J. Davidson, “Making Government Work: Pragmatic Priorities for Interagency Coordination,” *Orbis*, Vol 53, Issue 3, pp. 419–438, 2009.
- W.J. Davis, “The Effect of Teaching Style and Duration of Class Time on the Sense of Classroom Community of Military Urban Graduate Students,” Dissertation, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA, 2005.

S.B Desai, “Solving the Interagency Puzzle,” *Policy Review*, pp.57–71, February–March, 2005.

P.M. Doney, J.P. Cannon, and M.R. Mullen, “Understanding the Influence of National Culture on the Development of Trust,” *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 23, No. 3, pp. 601–620, 1998.

R. Egnall, “Explaining U.S. and British Performance in Complex Expeditionary Operations: The Civil-Military Dimension,” *The Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 6, pp. 1041–1075, December, 2006.

A. Etzioni, *The Spirit of Community: Rights and Responsibility and the Communitarian Agenda*, Crown, New York, 1993.

K. Hall, “Constant Disloyalty and the Keys to Community: Bigger Is Not Always Better When it Comes to Co-operation,” *Human Resource International Digest*, Vol. 16, Issue 7, pp. 33–36, 2008.

J.L. Hill, “Psychological Sense of Community: Suggestions for Future Research,” *Journal of Community Psychology*, Vol. 24(4), pp. 431-438, 1996.

G.R. Jones, and J.M. George, “The Experience and Evolution of Trust: Implications for Cooperation and Teamwork,” *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 23, No. 3, pp. 531–546, 1998.

C.R. Kemp, *Trust—the Key to Leadership in Network Centric Environments*, U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA, 2003.

W.H. Lambright, “The Rise and Fall of Interagency Cooperation: The U.S. Global Change Research Program,” *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 57, No. 1, pp. 36–44, 1997.

J.R. Locher, “Has It worked? The Goldwater-Nichols Reorganization Act—Department of Defense Reorganization,” *Naval War College Review*, Autumn 2001.

J.R. Locher, *Victory on the Potomac*, Texas A&M University Press, College Station, TX, 2002.

D.H. McKnight, L.L. Cummings, and N.L. Chervany, “Initial Trust Formation in New Organizational Relationships,” *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 23, No. 3, pp. 473–490, 1998.

D.W. McMillan, “Sense of Community,” *Journal of Community Psychology*, Vol. 24(4), pp. 315–325, 1996.

J. Moon, “Force Protection for the ‘Hidden Wounds’ of War,” *Army*, Arlington, VA, Vol. 57 (1), pp. 51–54, January 2007.

C.R., Paparone and J.A. Crupi, “United We Stand...? Achieving Intelligence Interagency Synergy in Complex Warfare,” *American Intelligence Journal*, Summer 2006.

C.R., Paparone, “The Nature of Soldierly Trust,” *Military Review*, November–December 2002.

Project on National Security Reform, <<http://www.pnsr.org>>, September 2009.

J.E. Puddifoot, “Some Initial Considerations in the Measurement of Community Identity,” *Journal of Community Psychology*, Vol. 24(4), pp. 365–379, 1996.

M.A. Royal and R.J. Rossi, “Individual-Level Correlates of Sense of Community: Findings from Workplace and School,” *Journal of Community Psychology*, Vol. 24(4), pp. 395–415, 1996.

S.B. Sarason, *The Psychological Sense of Community: Prospects for a Community Psychology*, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, CA, 1974.

D.R. Schwandt, “When Managers Become Philosophers: Integrating Learning with Sensemaking,” *Academy of Learning and Education*, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 176–192, 2005.

N. Sengupta, M.S. Battacharya, and R.N. Sengupta, *Managing Change in Organizations*, Prentice Hall, New Delhi, India, 2006.

D. Solomon, M. Watson, V. Battisch, E. Schaps, and K. Delucchi, “Creating Classrooms that Students Experience as Communities,” *American Journal of Community Psychology*, Vol. 24(6), pp. 719–748, 1996.

C.C. Sonn and A.T. Fisher, “Psychological Sense of Community in a Politically Constructed Group,” *Journal of Community Psychology*, Vol. 24(4), pp. 417–430, 1996.

M.E. Swiney, “Does Pre-conflict Integration of Multinational Combat Forces into Operational Warfare Increase Unity of Effort?” Paper submitted to faculty of Naval War College, 3 February 2003.

J.B. Thomas, S.M. Clark, and D.A. Gioia, “Strategic Sensemaking and Organizational Performance: Linkage Among Scanning, Interpretation, Action, and Outcomes,” *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 36, No. 2, pp. 239–270, 1993.

United States General Accounting Office (GAO), “Recent Campaigns Benefited from Improved Communications and Technology, but Barriers to Progress Remain,” Report to Congressional Committees, GAO-04-547, June 2004.

InterAgency Paper Series

The ***InterAgency Paper (IAP)*** series is published by the Simons Center for the Study of Interagency Cooperation. A work selected for publication as an ***IAP*** represents research by the author which, in the opinion of the Simons Center editorial board, will contribute to a better understand of a particular national security issue involving the cooperation, collaboration, and coordination between governmental departments, agencies, and offices.

Publication of an occasional ***InterAgency Paper*** does not indicate that the Simons Center agrees with the content or position of the author, but does suggest that the Center believes the paper will stimulate the thinking and discourse concerning important interagency security issues.

Contributions: The Simons Center encourages the submission of original papers based on research from primary sources or which stem from lessons learned via personal experiences. For additional information see “Simons Center Writers Submission Guidelines” on the Simons Center website at www.TheSimonsCenter.org/publications.

About the Simons Center

The Col. Arthur D. Simons Center for the Study of Interagency Cooperation is a major component of the Command and General Staff College Foundation. The Center’s mission is to foster and develop an interagency body of knowledge to enhance education at the U.S. Army CGSC while facilitating broader and more effective cooperation within the U.S. government at the operational and tactical levels through study, research, analysis, publication, and outreach.

About the CGSC Foundation

The Command and General Staff College Foundation, Inc., was established on December 28, 2005 as a tax-exempt, non-profit educational foundation that provides resources and support to the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College in the development of tomorrow’s military leaders. The CGSC Foundation helps to advance the profession of military art and science by promoting the welfare and enhancing the prestigious educational programs of the CGSC. The CGSC Foundation supports the College’s many areas of focus by providing financial and research support for major programs such as the Simons Center, symposia, conferences, and lectures, as well as funding and organizing community outreach activities that help connect the American public to their Army. All Simons Center works are published by the “CGSC Foundation Press.”

Col. Arthur D. Simons Center
655 Biddle Blvd., PO Box 3429
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas 66027
ph: 913-682-7244
www.TheSimonsCenter.org



CGSC Foundation Press
100 Stimson Avenue, Suite 1149
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas 66027
ph: 913-651-0624
www.cgscfoundation.org